

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE/METHOD/EXEMPTION 3B2B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2008

VIA: (SPECIFY AIR OR SEA FOUCH)

SECRET

CLASSIFICATION

DATE: 25 November 1957

DESENSITIZED

BY DOI 70-19

TO : Chief, SR
Attn: []
FROM : Chief of Base, Munich []

DATE: 25 November 1957

INFO: CDS/G
EE

SUBJECT: GENERAL—Operational/REDWOOD/LCIMPROVE/AEBATH

SPECIFIC—AEBAPLIN/1's Reaction to his Third LCFLUTTER

REFS: A. ECMA-29660, 31 October 1957
B. ECMA-20222, 28 August 1956

Action Required: None; for your information.

1. Forwarded as a separate cover attachment is a translation of a paper provided by AEBAPLIN/1 containing his remarks and reactions following LCFLUTTER which was administered on 25 October 1957. The report was forwarded as Reference A.

2. A comparison of AEBAPLIN/1's remarks in the attachment and his remarks following the second LCFLUTTER (found in Reference B) indicates a broad difference in reaction. Apparently he was completely satisfied with the manner in which the entire affair was handled and appeared to be extremely happy with the operator whom he describes very favorably.

3. On the whole, the results of the latest LCFLUTTER appear to be very favorable except in the instance where he appeared possibly to be practicing deception on the question concerning UPSWING. The undersigned, who has tried to keep close tab via mail and telephone intercepts and requirements relative to AEBAPLIN/1's reporting, feels that this reaction should be viewed with minor importance until something arises during the course of the operation to merit taking a second look at this reaction. It is felt that anything AEBAPLIN/1 neglected to report (which we picked up via intercepts) was probably due to forgetfulness and the lack of importance which AEBAPLIN/1 attaches to his UPSWING relationship.

APPROVED: []

Attachments: As stated U/S/C

Distribution:

- 3 - SR Att U/S/C
- 2 - EE Att U/S/C
- 2 - CDS/G Att U/S/C

DESENSITIZED

COPY ROUTING	
1	3
2	3
3	3
4	
5	

FORM NO. 51-28 A
MAY 1949

SECRET

Att: A to EGMA-30099

SUBJECT: Comments re. Polygraph Examination on 25 October 1957.

REPORT: #IS-57-223, dated 29 October 1957

SOURCE: AECAPLIN/1

DESENSITIZED
EX 401 29-17

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS:

1. Admitting sincerely and openly that when (C) on 24 October 1957 asked me about my thoughts regarding another polygraph examination, I replied without giving any thought, "Yes", I would take it and I was happy in the thought that I certainly would pass the test. I was happy for the following reasons:

a. During the course of the past two years of my association with the AIS, I noted in part and felt in part that my superiors did not have complete faith in me. I was aware of the fact that lack of faith by my superiors was based partially because of my own doing (as regards my deception concerning my true wife and the woman whom I posed as my wife) and partially because of external influences on which I had no influence (e.g., visit to me by Otto KRUEGER, arrival of my true wife, recent correspondence from the Ukraine from my mother to former in-laws and perhaps other reasons not known to me but known to the superiors). This decidedly did not lead to a good atmosphere of collaboration. Therefore, I felt that if it was not clear from declarations during earlier discussions with (C) that I was clear with myself, that is, my conscience, and with my superiors, I did not have the slightest doubt that the test would result only and absolutely positively and favorably. With this I do not say that the results of the polygraph will be positive in terms of the polygraphy operator or my superiors. It is possible that, in spite of everything, they will have some doubts. However, I am absolutely certain that my responses were not only truthful but sincere and frank.

b. I felt that following the examination various justified and unjustified suspicions about me would be resolved. For this reason I was very happy to submit myself to this test. I was prepared to answer questions on the test which had no bearing on my effort; that is, questions of a personal nature which at times lower the dignity of an individual. I was prepared to answer these questions despite any shame, insult, ambition, etc., which I would feel inwardly. I decided on this not knowing what type of questions would be posed and I was prepared to answer them since I wanted to provide evidence that all such suspicions or distrust in me were without any basis. Therefore, now I can boldly say the following: I submitted myself to the two earlier examinations because I was aware of the fact that this was a regulation of the AIS, meaning that I fulfilled an obligation which I could not escape and in which I personally had no interest. I considered the two earlier tests as being in the interest of the office and not as in my own interest. On the other hand, I considered the most recent test, from the very first moment that I learned about it, that is, learned

DESENSITIZED
EX 401 29-17

SECRET

-2-

ATT: A to EGMA-30099

that I would have to go through with it, not only as something which was of interest to the office but as something which was of the utmost interest to me. Perhaps one of the buero's psychologists will see some "egoism" in this statement and perhaps it is in truth a manifestation of my egoism. However, this is exactly what occurred and I talk about it very openly.

COMMENTS ON VARIOUS QUESTIONS IN THE TEST:

2. I was aware of the fact that my superiors perhaps are not satisfied with my replies in various instances, that is, the "yes" and "no" replies. Perhaps they expected that I would say "yes" to a "no" question, and "no" to a "yes" question. However, years ago I said that I would be completely sincere and frank whether or not it would suit anyone's feelings, even if it would mean that I would suffer the loss of some sympathy or if it would cool our mutual relations. I write all of this because the polygraph operator (very likeable, pleasant, amiable, intelligent and tactful) asked me why I replied "no" to one question and "yes" to another.

3. At this moment, I cannot recall the exact formula of all the questions but I remember them in their approximate form and would like to clarify why I gave one or another answer. There were two questions which were similarly formulated: one, if I work for the AIS exclusively for monetary reasons, to which I replied "no", and an analogical question regarding GIS to which I replied "yes", that is, for monetary reasons. Here, perhaps, the thought may arise that I am illogical or that I did not tell the truth or was not sincere. Nevertheless, I must convince the reader that I was absolutely logical, and still more, sincere.

4. When I replied "no" to the question relative to the AIS, I did so for reasons of the following motives:

a. I, as an old nationalist, former (OUN) Provid member or one of the providnyky of the Ukrainian nationalist movement in West Ukraine, from my youth was oriented against Communism as a confirmed ideological and world movement as well as against Communism as a form of state government. I have today completely different views about Ukrainian nationalism than I had during the 1920s. However, my views regarding Communism are absolutely the same as they were in the 1920s. In my opinion, there are today in the world only two forces which can struggle with one another to any degree, i.e., the United States, for which I work today, and the USSR, which I have always fought and which I fight today with my modest contribution. I believe in the strength of my country and its people. However, I am aware that only outside assistance, that is, aid from the United States, can speed up the liberation of my fatherland. In view of this, I do not consider my association with the AIS as a personal business but I treat it as one of the means which will hasten the liberation of my fatherland. It is for this reason that I have always considered and still consider monetary assistance from the buero as an expedient toward the execution of my effort and not as my life's goal.

DECLASSIFIED
per GSN 43-16

SECRET

ATT: A to EGMA-30099

b. When I replied "yes" to the question concerning the GIS this reply was sincere. It was sincere because, after considering that it is my inner conviction and taking into consideration my earlier intelligence work, all that I now accomplish for the GIS is completely outside the intelligence effort in the essential meaning of that word. For the most part, I summarize or translate notations from the Ukrainian press which are generally known and which have no semblance of secrecy. Any man can do this if he knows how to read and write and if he has any knowledge of the German language. I consider this to be strictly a technical translation with addition of my commentary. This is one thing. Another is that I am aware that Germany today does not play, and in the foreseeable future, will not play an important role as a powerful world political force. As history points out, the occupation by Germany of the Ukraine evidenced that they wanted one odious regime to replace another which was not less odious. If the Germans would have conducted themselves differently in the Ukraine had they themselves occupied the Ukraine without assistance of other Western powers is another question. Therefore, my position relative to my collaboration with the GIS is: "If you (meaning GIS) want to have such information which I give you for which I spend a portion of time which could be spent for relaxation or reading, etc., then please pay for it. Here, decidedly, commercial interests stand in the first position. If you do not wish to pay me, no tears will be shed. These are my sincere positions regarding one "no" and another "yes".

5. There was another question which had the following sense: Was I more satisfied with my collaboration with the Abwehrstelle than with the AIS? The sentence did not read thus exactly but the sense is there. I replied "yes" to this question. I believe that in my earlier written or oral commentaries I have already touched on this question. Today should my reply be for some reader not understood (or perhaps even insulting), then I wish to say the following: I replied sincerely and frankly; it was not my intention to insult anyone or to humble or humiliate the AIS or to consider my current superiors as unfriendly. When I said "yes", I had the following in mind: My work with the Abwehrstelle took place as the result of completely different political conditions. A war was taking place. We conducted a struggle against the Bolsheviks. Every one of us carried a definite responsibility for a job and also for its results. Each one of us had a position which was outlined in minutest detail. Each one of us had with his position appropriate documentation, appropriate salary, appropriate expedients for the effort in the nature of financial and technical support. I knew my chiefs, their families, their positions in the Abwehrstelle and they knew everything about me. Our mutual relationships were as friend to friend. We were happy with our mutual successes and achievements and we grieved together at our failures. I was assigned a certain segment of work for which I was accountable. My word in this activity obligated everyone; my superiors counted on it and my workers executed it.

a. In the Abwehrstelle more attention was centered on the personal aspects of the collaborator, including appropriate quarters, proper clothing,

SECRET



-4-

ATT: A to EGMA-30099

that he received relaxation or rest periods on time, that he could take leave where ever he pleased, etc. In one word, the Abwehrstelle took away from us all of our private troubles so that we could concentrate exclusively on our work. The Abwehrstelle took care of our clandestinity and did so in a very practical and real manner. For example, to plant me as a CI man in Sanok on the Soviet border, the Abwehrstelle made sure that I operated without putting out one cent and obtained for me a brewery, a relatively large enterprise, monthly profit of which (after paying about 15 workers) was about 15,000 sloty, i.e., about DM 7,500. My cover as a merchant had been established solidly. I also received from the Abwehrstelle in Sanok a six or seven room house for living quarters, etc. The Abwehrstelle provided appropriate documents which I could use to travel freely throughout all the then German occupied territories, not only for reasons of operations but also for relaxation and leave.

b. The Abwehrstelle had absolute trust in us. Its principle was as follows: Either we have faith in the person and we will collaborate with that person, or we have no faith in the person and will release him. This faith was evident whenever our chiefs mixed with us, either during contacts of an operational or personal nature.

c. I am aware that today conditions and circumstances are completely different and that I cannot expect all of the same from my American friends with whom I work. This brings to mind a number of items which I will not describe here but which I do bear in mind. However, when the question on the test was put to me, I had to reply, "yes". Had I said anything else, it would have been untrue. And I did not wish to speak an untruth.

6. Then there was the question if I considered that the Americans have faith in me to which I replied "no". It is possible that I am mistaken. However, I have had the feeling and it has been with me a long time that my American friends do not have absolute faith in me, that is, they value my work, consider that my reports aren't bad, but do not have faith in me as a person. For example, I am convinced that all of my correspondence is controlled; likewise, I am convinced that all of my telephone conversations are tapped; and sometimes I even think that I am under personal surveillance. This, of course, does not bother me in any way. I correspond with everyone with whom I feel it is necessary; my telephonic conversations are conducted as though I did not know my phone is tapped and I move about in town or out of town freely. I do not feel cramped in any way. On the contrary, I am very happy with all of this since it is the only way in which the AIS can change its position concerning me, have more faith in me, faith which I personally was responsible partially for losing. On the other hand, I cannot say that these situations (letter and phone taps and surveillance) are really taking place since I do not have concrete evidence of such. This should be regarded merely as my feelings on the subject. However, these feelings influenced my reply, "no", when I was asked if I felt that the Americans did not have any faith in me.

DECLASSIFIED
13-75

SECRET

-5-

ATT: A to EGMA-30099

7. Perhaps there were other affairs or questions touched on during the test on which I could make comment; but I cannot recall them and do not comment on them. I very freely and happily will provide any clarification if and when necessary.

DECLASSIFIED
3-28